

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

None of the claims are amended herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3-7 and 9-18 are currently pending and under consideration in the present application.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3-7 and 9-18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(E) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY KITAGAWA ET AL. (USP# 5,898,234)

In item 4, on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-7 and 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kitagawa (USP# 5,898,234).

Claim 1 of the present application relates to a power supply control device which comprises "a first power supply input terminal to which a power supply is provided via an interface power supply; a second power supply input terminal to which a power supply is provided via an AC adaptor," and "a power supply input detection unit determining whether an input of the second power supply input terminal is above a predetermined value." The power supply control device also comprises "a switching unit cutting off power supplied by said first power supply input terminal via the interface power supply, and activating a power supplied by said second power supply input terminal via the AC adaptor if the input to said second power supply input terminal is above the predetermined value even if the input to said first power supply input terminal via the interface power supply is present."

Kitagawa discloses a battery source 33, an AC adaptor 31, and a power feed status detection unit 34. In column 11, lines 20-23 and 52-55, Kitagawa discloses, "while the normal voltage is being supplied by the AC adaptor 31, the power feed status detection unit 34 outputs a signal for turning the FET 73 OFF to the gate-controlled circuit 52," and that "upon detection of a power failure of the AC adaptor 31, the power feed status detection unit 34 supplies a signal for causing the FET 73 to be turned ON to the gate-controlled circuit 52."

In light of the teachings above, the Examiner believes that the FET 73 of Kitagawa is the same as the claimed switching unit.

However, Kitagawa does not disclose that the battery 33 is provided via an interface power supply. Moreover, Kitagawa does not disclose that the FET 73 is configured to cut off

power supplied by the battery 33, and activate power supplied by the AC adaptor 31 if an input power to the AC adaptor 31 is above a predetermined value even if the battery 33 is present. In fact, Kitagawa fails to disclose a scenario which would suggest that priority would be given to power supplied by the AC adaptor 31 in the event that both the AC adaptor 31 and the battery 33 were present in the power supply unit of Kitagawa. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the teachings and the configuration Fig. 9 of Kitagawa are fundamentally different for the present application.

Thus, Kitagawa fails to disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Claims 7 and 15-18 disclose similar features as recited in claim 1, regarding the claimed switching unit.

For example, claim 7 recites "a switch unit which cuts off a power supply from said first power supply input terminal via the interface power supply and activates a power supply from said second power supply input terminal via the AC adaptor when the input from said second power supply input terminal is above the predetermined value according to said power supply input detection unit even if the input to said first power supply input terminal via the interface power supply is present," which distinguishes over the cited prior art.

Claim 15 recites "a switching unit cutting off power supplied by said first input terminal via the interface power supply and activating a power supplied by said second input terminal via the AC adaptor if the input to said second input terminal is above the predetermined value even if the input to said first power supply input terminal via the interface power supply is present," which distinguishes over the cited prior art.

Claim 16 recites "a switching unit cutting off power supplied by said first input terminal via the interface power supply and activating a power supplied by said second input terminal via the AC adaptor if the input to said second input terminal is above the predetermined value even if the input to said first power supply input terminal via the interface power supply is present," which distinguishes over the cited prior art.

Claim 17 recites "a switching unit to cut off power supplied by the first input terminal via the interface power supply and activating a power supplied by the second input terminal via the adaptor if the input to said second input terminal is above a predetermined value even if the input to the first power supply input terminal via the interface power supply is present," which distinguishes over the cited prior art.

Claim 18 recites "cutting off power supplied by the first input terminal via the interface power supply and activating a power supplied by the second input terminal via the adaptor if the input to the second input terminal is above a predetermined value even if the input to the first power supply input terminal via the interface power supply is present," which distinguishes over the cited prior art.

Claims 3-6 and claims 9-14 depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively. Therefore, for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 7 distinguish over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-6 and claim 9-14 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 5 AND 11 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER KITAGAWA ET AL. (USP# 5,898,234)

The comments in section II, above, also apply here because claims 5 and 11 depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively. Therefore, for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 7 distinguish over the cited prior art, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5 and 11 also distinguish over the cited prior art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10-16-03

By: Derrick L. Fields
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501